

BEBR

FACULTY WORKING
PAPER NO. 89-1621

Berkeley's Querist and Its Influence

Salim Rashid

The Library of the
JAN 25 1990
University of Illinois
of Urbana-Champaign



College of Commerce and Business Administration
Bureau of Economic and Business Research
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

BEBR

FACULTY WORKING PAPER NO. 89-1621

College of Commerce and Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

December 1989

Berkley's Querist and Its Influence

Salim Rashid

Department of Economics



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

<http://www.archive.org/details/berkleysqueristi1621rash>

ABSTRACT

George Berkeley's view of Economic Development as dependent upon human development (in the wider sense) is elaborated upon and Berkeley's influence on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries documented.

Key words: George Berkeley, Querist, Economic Development.

Berkeley's Querist and Its Influence

I. George Berkeley is unusual among economists for his practical dedication. While a great many pamphleteers write about acting for the "public good" it is rare to find someone involved in such acts on an everyday basis.¹

Our spinning-school is in a thriving way. The children begin to find a pleasure in being paid in hard money; which I understand they will not give to their parents, but keep to buy clothes for themselves. Indeed I found it difficult and tedious to bring them to this; but I believe it will now do. I am building a workhouse for sturdy vagrants, and design to raise about two acres of hemp for employing them. Can you put me in a way of getting hemp-seed; or does your Society distribute any? It is hoped your flax-seed will come in time.

Berkeley was certainly not alone in thus trying to inspire development from below. He was one member of a group of public-spirited Irishmen known as the Dublin Society. Instead of confronting hostile English colonial policy in the manner of Dean Swift, this group took the view that one should do whatever was feasible within the constraints set by the English. With its emphasis upon simple practicable measures, the philosophy of the Dublin Society was very congenial to Berkeley's general aim of returning philosophy from the elite to the common man. While several members of the Dublin Society wrote pamphlets on economics, it is Berkeley who provided the most cogent and philosophical treatment of the issues facing underdeveloped Ireland and it is to the Querist that we must turn for the insights of permanent value.²

In 1976 the Kress Library of the Harvard Business School, which houses one of the finest collections of pamphlets on the early economics literature, produced a paper entitled "The Economics Best-Sellers Before 1850." The paper described all those economics tracts, several editions of which had been called for before the end of the eighteenth century. While the paper contained references to the works of Thomas Mun, John Cary, Joshua Gee, Adam Smith and so on, the Querist of Bishop Berkeley was conspicuous by its absence. Since some ten editions of the Querist had been called for within 25 years of its publication in 1737, it easily qualified as a "best seller." Upon inquiry, I was told that since the title of the Querist did not contain any of the jargon words, "economic" or "financial" or "commercial," no one paid attention to it. Perhaps Berkeley had succeeded too well in his desire to speak only plain sense! After absorbing the wisdom of the Querist, people forgot the source and remembered, at best, only some striking phrase or query. Over the years, therefore, I have tried to gather instances where Berkeley has been referred to, and to assess his contemporary relevance. This essay describes those instances that I have found as well as providing some notes on Berkeley's significance. I begin by inquiring into Berkeley's views on economic growth and economic development.³

II. The first five queries of the Querist set the message of the pamphlet in embryo.⁴

Query 1 Whether there ever was, is, or will be, an industrious nation poor, or an idle rich?

2 Whether a people can be called poor, where the common sort are well fed, clothed, and lodged?

3 Whether the drift and aim of every wise State should not be, to encourage industry in its members? And whether those who employ neither heads nor hands for the common benefit deserve not to be expelled like drones out of a well-governed State?

4 Whether the four elements, and man's labour therein, be not the true source of wealth?

5 Whether money be not only so far useful, as it stirrith up industry, enabling men mutually to participate the fruits of each other's labour?

Queries 1, 3 and 5 stand together. It is hard work that makes a people rich; the State should encourage all its members to work hard; practically speaking, the most effective way to stimulate a people to hard work is through the use of a money economy and money is valuable to society only insofar as it continues to encourage industry. The fourth query can be considered a clarification of the earlier ones, in that it makes clear that any increase in wealth must come from production--"the four elements and man's labor therein." It is well-known that the immediate aim of the Querist was to support the formation of a National Bank and thereby serve the economic development of Ireland. This theme therefore appears repeatedly. For example, nos. 21-47, 218-254, 277-327, 424-450, 458-497, 555-578, explain the roles of money, paper money and credit and go on to point out their importance in encouraging the industry of both rich and poor.

The concern for monetary reform is the aspect of the Querist that has gained the greatest attention, which is perhaps unfortunate because the message of Query 2 and the second half of Query 3 are equally important. Scholars have believed that this was an age ruled by a Midas-like belief in the precious metals and hence have seen Berkeley's greatest originality to lie in demolishing this belief.⁵ But what if this characterization of the eighteenth century has only a slender foundation? Indeed, if this belief were of primary importance, why would Berkeley address it directly only near the very end, in queries 555-570?

In queries 2 and 3, we come face-to-face with Berkeley's considerable originality. He defines the wealth of a nation to consist of the comforts of life, properly distributed. Berkeley cannot repeat this point with sufficient force. It is because the poor are important that Berkeley is so insistent on developing the home trade, so that the poor can improve their condition by using the resources close at hand. Berkeley reiterates these points in queries 56-100, 105-140, partially in 360-423 and in 458-497, and finally in queries 498-554.

The responsibility for providing the poor with the chance to live decently lay with the rich. The Industry of the people had to be aroused, and Industry was stimulated by demand. The demand of the rich arose as conspicuous consumption while that of the poor had to be stimulated. Berkeley addressed the rich in two ways. On the one hand, he urged them to think more about the plight of Ireland; on the other hand, he realized that the upper classes would insist on

distinguishing themselves by their manner of consumption. Why could they not do so using Irish goods--why not build well and live well off the plentitude of Irish materials? This constructive program required a serious effort on the part of the Irish rich. Berkeley repeatedly tells them to think more, pay attention to education, to sound marriages, to passing better laws and to rid themselves of destructive fashions imported from abroad. This is the message of queries 6-12, 101-105, 141-217, 328-347, partly in 328-423 and in 451-457.

This presentation of Berkeley's economic views differs from some existing interpretations only by its emphasis. T. W. Hutchison, for example, presents Berkeley's program under three heads⁶

- (a) the supply curve of labour and the labour market,
- (b) fiscal policy and problems of the balance of payments, and
- (c) monetary institutions and policy.

This is entirely correct, but the manner of presentation suggests that Berkeley's was (only?) a short-run program. Hutchison's observation that the Querist was "arranged with an apparently extreme and provocative haphazardness" is not only unjustified, it also tends to discourage one from seeking a more lasting message from the pamphlet.⁷

(Ian Ward's claim that Berkeley held "ad hoc economic views" is just plain wrong.) An insightful account of Berkeley's thought has recently been presented by Patrick Kelly, who attributes the following to the Querist⁸

- (1) The wealth of a nation consists of the proper feeding, clothing, and housing of the mass of the population.
- (2) This wealth is created by human industry.

- (3) The aim of the state should therefore be to encourage the industry of its inhabitants.
- (4) Money is only useful insofar as it serves to stimulate industry.
- (5) Money is only valuable insofar as it represents power over the products of the industry of others.
- (6) Power relates to appetite, which in turn is largely dependent on fashion.
- (7) The state should seek to control fashion, and thus direct the appetite of the people.
- (8) The gentry [presumably as the consumption class] set the pattern of aspirations for the rest of the people.
- (9) Successful regulation of the economy so as to achieve (1) depends on educating the gentry as to their real interest.
- (10) The Irish are prevented from 'thriving by that cynical content in dirt . . . [exceeding] any other people in Christendom'.
- (11) The Irish can only be made industrious by awakening in them an appetite for a reasonable standard of living.
- (12) Given basic geographic and climatic factors, a country's wealth is proportionate to the industry of its people, which in turn depends on the 'the circulation of credit, be the credit circulated or transferred by what means so ever'.
- (13) 'The true idea of money as such . . . [is] that of a ticket or counter.'
- (14) Since the attainment of (1) depends on the will or opinion of the people, this may be achieved without the mediation of gold and silver in exchange.

The only deficiency in this summary (as is perceptively noted by Patrick Murray in his comment on Kelly) lies in its prior claim that⁹ "The key to the arguments of The Querist lies in Berkeley's rejection of the chief bastion of mercantilist thinking, namely that national wealth is universally dependent on foreign trade." By giving this point so much (apparent) importance, Kelly has hurt his own thesis. Berkeley appears to have appreciated the value of Foreign Trade at least since 1718, after his travels in Europe. On receiving

Thomas Prior's A List of Absentees, Berkeley wrote back in May 1730

(Prior's pamphlet followed).

That it would be the interest of England to allow a free trade to Ireland, I have been thoroughly convinced ever since my being in Italy, and have upon all occasions endeavoured to convince English gentlemen thereof, and have convinced some, both in and out of Parliament; and I remember to have discoursed with you at large upon this subject when I was last in Ireland. (emphasis added)

And in the Essay of 1721 Berkeley had already noted¹⁰

Money is so far useful to the public as it promoteth industry, and credit having the same effect is of the same value with money.

Points (10) and (11) of Kelly (also raised earlier by Hutchison) deserve further emphasis, especially in view of several persistent misinterpretations of the "Christian" tradition in economic thought. In response to Mandeville's claim that any and every form of spending should be looked upon kindly because of the stimulation to demand, Berkeley pithily asked in Alciphron "I would fain know whether money innocently spent doth not circulate as well as that spent upon vice?" In the Querist Berkeley is even more forceful in advocating new wants among the poor in order to spur them to steady labor, cleanliness and civilization.

19. Whether the creating of wants be not the likeliest way to produce industry in a people?
20. And whether, if our peasants were accustomed to eat beef and wear shoes, they would not be more industrious?

Not only was there no support for "rigorism" among the great majority of the Church but there was support for the poor to consume properly in order to stimulate economic activity. The problem posed by Colin

Campbell in his recent book is certainly greatly exaggerated and perhaps even spurious.¹¹

In the absence of any references given in the Querist scholars have naturally assumed that Berkeley was familiar with the best thought of his day.¹² This is a reasonable procedure but it has perhaps been applied too strongly in Berkeley's case. As Joseph Schumpeter has carefully emphasized, it is not enough simply to provide an idea, one must also be careful to embed the idea in a structure. Whatever the published works of John Locke and John Law may have had to say on the role of money, Berkeley's careful working out of the institutional structure necessary to support a National Bank in Ireland does not appear to have had any predecessors. More credit is surely due to Berkeley for his attempt in Part III of the Querist.

The manner in which Berkeley's views have been viewed hitherto thus needs modification; furthermore, the importance of changes in the earlier and later versions have not been adequately noted.¹³ The provision of a National Bank was of paramount importance in the first edition of 1735. When interest in this issue was not aroused, Berkeley omitted hundreds of queries and wrote instead an Irish manual for underdevelopment. It is well-known that all the queries dealing with the practicability of the Bank were omitted in the second edition. The additions, however, are significant, just as we would expect from a literary craftsman like Berkeley.

First, in view of Berkeley's attention to the role of the State and his suggestion that criminals be forced to do hard labor, it is

important to note how he added several queries emphasizing the importance of merchants, nos. 265-268. The linking of this issue with a more liberal attitude towards Roman Catholics is significant, especially in view of A Word to the Wise, a pamphlet shortly to be addressed specifically to Roman Catholics.

265 Whether a squire possessed of land to the value of a thousand pounds per annum, or a merchant worth twenty thousand pounds in cash, would have most power to do good or evil upon any emergency? And whether the suffering Roman Catholics to purchase forfeited lands would not be good policy, as tending to unite their interest with that of the government?

266 Whether the sea-ports of Galway, Limerick, Cork, and Waterford are not to be looked on as keys of this kingdom? And whether the merchants are not possessed of these keys; and who are the most numerous merchants in those cities?

267 Whether a merchant cannot more speedily raise a sum, more easily conceal or transfer his effects, and engage in any desperate design with more safety, than a landed man, whose estate is a pledge for his behaviour?

268 Whether a wealthy merchant bears not great sway among the populace of a trading city? And whether power be not ultimately lodged in the people?

Next, the importance of education and of sensible marriages is developed with more care. Berkeley cautions the Irish in making sensible laws and to avoid rash political action. There is only one addition on monetary affairs, but it is a significant one. Berkeley makes some perceptive remarks on the value of the National Debt.

232 Whether that which increaseth the stock of a nation be not a means of increasing its trade? And whether that which increaseth the current credit of a nation may not be said to increase its stock?

233 Whether the credit of the public funds be not a mine of gold to England? And whether any step that should lessen this credit ought not to be dreaded?

234 Whether such credit be not the principal advantage that England hath over France? I may add, over every other country in Europe?

235 Whether by this the public is not become possessed of the wealth of foreigners as well as natives? And whether England be not in some sort the treasury of Christendom?

236 Whether, as our current domestic credit grew, industry would not grow likewise; and if industry, our manufactures; and if these, our foreign credit?

If David Hume or Adam Smith saw the second edition, this point about the stability provided the financial system by the National Debt must have quite eluded them.¹⁴

Once all the changes are viewed together, what emerges is the importance of human development as the prime feature in Berkeley's vision of development. Already in the Essay of 1721, Berkeley had noted that¹⁵

There is still room for Invention or Improvement in most Trades and Manufactures; and it is probable, that Premiums given on that account to ingenious Artists would soon be re-paid a hundred-fold to the Public.

Ultimately, it is the intelligence and virtue of people that gives rise to satisfactory development, both in the sense of a larger national product as well as one which would provide more happiness. At the conclusion of the Querist, Berkeley repeats his primary policy proposals so as to remind all readers about what needs to be done. Before this concluding call to action, however, he summarizes his view of the whole process of development.

581 Whether faculties are not enlarged and improved by exercise?

582 Whether the sum of the faculties put into act, or in other words, the united action of a whole people doth not constitute the momentum of a State?

583 Whether such momentum be not the real stock or whether of a State?

584 Whether in every wise State the faculties of the mind are not most considered?

585 Whether the momentum of a State doth not imply the whole exertion of its faculties, intellectual and corporeal; and whether the latter without the former could act in concert?

Berkeley would appear to be the first economist who felt that economic development was really but one aspect of human development.

As befits a philosopher who repeatedly asked whether it be not more important to know what wealth is for than to acquire wealth, Berkeley set an example in encouraging the fine arts.¹⁶

Berkeley's abode at Cloyne was celebrated as a home of the arts. A contemporary allusion illustrates the modest representation of his letter to Prior. "The episcopal house [of Cloyne]," says Smith, "was rebuilt by Bishop Crowe, in which he died. His present lordship [Bishop Berkeley] has successfully transplanted the polite arts, which before flourished in a warmer soil, to this northern climate. Painting and music are no longer strangers in Ireland, nor confined to Italy. In the episcopal palace of Cloyne, the eye is entertained with a great variety of good paintings, as well as the ear with concerts of excellent music. There are here some pieces of the best masters, as a Magdalen by Sir Peter Paul Rubens; some heads by Van Dyke and Kneller...

It is this combination of a cool head and a warm heart that makes Berkeley still a figure of such interest. As a recent scholar has written of Berkeley on philosophy¹⁷

why should we now be concerned with Berkeley?
The motive of the present work is not antiquarian.
It springs rather from the conviction that the
intellectual society of Berkeley is salutary for
us, the more so because we belong to substantially
the same historical cycle.

III. The prevalent view of Berkeley's influence as an economist is that the penetrating queries of the Querist were notable only in their impact upon Irish Nationalism. One of the most careful and sympathetic commentators of Berkeley and his age is Joseph Johnston, who summarizes Berkeley's influence as follows:

The secret of Berkeley's influence on his fellow-Irishmen in his own day and on national leaders in later ages is to be found as much in his personal character as in his intellectual achievements.

John Mitchel, Thomas Davis, Isaac Butt, and in our own day Arthur Griffith, George Russell, and Eamon de Valera, have frankly recognised the debt the nation owes to the heart as well as to the head of this great Irishman.

T. W. Hutchison, on the other hand, finds evidence for Berkeley's practical influence vague while his impact on economists has been¹⁸ "undeservedly sketchy and slight." I will suggest that Berkeley may have had a greater impact than has hitherto been ascribed to him. The difficulty lies partly in Berkeley's manner of writing and partly in the fact that "influence" has to be somewhat differently traced at a time when economics was not a separate discipline but rather a branch of literature.

Shortly after the publication of the Querist the merchant David Bindon enlisted its authority to support his scheme for supplying industrious people with money.¹⁹

The Right Reverend, and most deservedly esteemed Author of the Querist, seems to favour a Method of this Kind, for exciting the Industry of our People.

Qu. 56. "Whether it be true, that the Poor of "Holland have no Resource but their Labour, and "yet there are no Beggars in their Streets?

This is most certainly true, and one of the most prevailing Causes thereof is, the easy Means the Poor of that Country have of obtaining Money in the Way proposed by the following Scheme. Thus the Poor are excited to Industry, whilst they are able to Work, and the Profits arising on the Loans, afford a Fund more than sufficient to provide a comfortable Maintenance, for those who are not able to Labour. (Preface, A2)

When the Querist was reprinted in Glasgow in 1751, in the Printers Address To the Reader, the brothers Foulis noted how they had already reprinted several treatises on economic subjects, to which the Querist was now added because it was believed to have had much effect on improving public spirit in Ireland. They praised the Querist for containing "so just and extensive a view of the true sources of wealth and happiness to a country, so many valuable hints for improving the necessary, the useful and the ornamental arts."²⁰

Nor were the Scots alone in perceiving Berkeley to have had some impact. In the Introduction to his Dictionary, Malachy Postlethwayt noted the impact of Berkeley on some of the Irish poor in his (rather partial) review of the impact of the English upon Ireland.²¹

English laws and government having introduced arts, labour, industry, and trade among them, they have grown populous and wealthy, humane, civilized, and polite, in comparison to what they were; excepting those who, among that nation, will obstinately adhere to their life of indolence, and savage brutality; of which the late and learned Dr. Berkeley, bishop of Cloyne, greatly complained; and from which he took great pains to reclaim them.

In 1761, a selection of Queries was annexed to The Danger of Popery and the anonymous author added that though first published in 1735 the queries were²²

very apposite to the present Examination. They have lost no part of their weight, but unhappily acquired much strength, by time. The political writings of that admirable philosopher and good man, cannot be considered too minutely by men, who have a share in the legislation of their country.

Berkeley's lucid and cosmopolitan approach also drew the attention of the (anonymous) translator of Quesnay's Tableau Economique who contrasted the "economical" virtues with those of soldiers and politicians.

How much more interesting must be the relation and discussion of those means, by which both nations and individuals may improve their happiness, not only without interfering with each other's interests, but to the great and universal benefit of all. And this, indeed, seems, now at last, to be pretty much the sense of the most thinking part of mankind, witness the good reception given to the works of Berkeley, and some other modern writers on that subject, who have handled it with a profoundness becoming philosophers, and a spirit worthy of citizens of the world.

A little later, Adam Anderson used the Querist as his authority for the trade of Cork and agreed that England could only gain from Ireland's prosperity.²³

Ireland is really a mine of treasure to Great Britain, and is so perhaps in a much greater degree than some of our American plantations; since much of what is gained in Ireland centers at length in Britain. And the ingenious author of a tract, entitled The Querist, published some time ago, rightly observes, that every severe step taken by us, with regard to Ireland, has been less injurious to it than advantageous to our foreign rivals.

One of the first economists of note to be explicitly influenced by Berkeley was the Rev. Robert Wallace, chaplain general of Scotland. The scholarship of Wallace was widely admired by his contemporaries and it is said that David Hume published his Essay "On the Populousness

of Ancient Nations" with the intent of pressuring Wallace make public his own manuscript on that subject. If it is remembered that Berkeley's chief proposal was the founding of a bank in Ireland, it will be seen from the following that Wallace entirely subscribed to Berkeley's views on this issue. Wallace refers to the "no less ingenious than pious Bishop of Cloyne" and contrasts the attitude of those who fear the public funds to that of Berkeley. Later, Wallace again quotes from Berkeley and explains in a footnote.

The following queries, proposed by the ingenious Bishop of Cloyne, serve to illustrate the nature of public funds, and shew, that what originally flowed from necessity and want, may afterwards become beneficial to the state.

Wallace goes on to quote Queries 233-235 and 296-300. Wallace, in fact argues as though Hume had accepted Berkeley's general principles--perhaps a gentle dig at Hume's failure to acknowledge his source.²⁴

If the people be generally industrious in improving their lands, and in making the best use of the produce of their own island, they may both become very numerous, and enjoy the comforts of life in great plenty, with little foreign trade. This is made out by the author of the Querist beyond the possibility of a reply. This is confessed by Mr. Hume [in his Political Discourse of Commerce]; who acknowledges, that, when industry and manufactures are once introduced into a nation, they may lose most of their foreign trade, and continue, notwithstanding, a great and powerful people.

Some 25 years later we find Thomas Mortimer, a writer of some popularity on the public funds, arguing that the National Debt was actually a benefit and praising Berkeley for having provided him with this insight.²⁵

In his Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Public Wealth, Lord Lauderdale notes that, among the several views held by Adam Smith of the sources of wealth, when Smith considers the real wealth of a country to consist in the annual produce of its land and labor, "this opinion . . . coincides with that of the Bishop of Cloyne." The reference is to Query 4

Whether the four elements, and mans labour therein,
be not the true source of wealth.

Later, Lauderdale argues for the benefits of the National Debt but makes no reference to Berkeley. This curious omission is perhaps explained by another reference given in Lauderdale's Thoughts on the Alarming State of the Circulation . . . in Ireland.²⁶

When we reflect on the state of the paper currency of New England at the time the shop notes were introduced, and contemplate that list of 56 male and 6 female issuers of I O U's, who have infested the district of Youghall, is it possible not to lament, that the Directors of the Bank of Ireland derived so little benefit from the following hint many years ago given to that country by the celebrated and ingenious bishop of Cloyne.

"201. Query. Whether any nation ever was in greater want of a Bank than Ireland?

"202. Query. Whether we may not easily avoid the inconveniences attending the paper money of New England, which were incurred by their issuing too great a quantity of notes?"

The reference here specifically says London edition. Of the several London editions, only that of 1751 consisted of the second, revised edition, when it was printed together with A Word to the Wise. It is quite possible that Lauderdale possessed only the first edition of the Querist and was therefore not aware of the closeness of his own thoughts and those of Berkeley on money.

Dugald Stewart is more visibly influenced by Berkeley in his Lectures on Political Economy. Stewart quotes Berkeley twice on the importance of velocity in computing the impact of a given stock of money and appears to accept wholly Berkeley's view of money as conventionally valuable.²⁷

I am therefore disposed to think, that Bishop Berkeley was not wide of the truth, (for I would not go so far as to adopt his idea in its full extent,) when he proposed the following doubts in his pamphlet, entitled The Querist, "Whether money is to be considered as having an intrinsic value, or as being a commodity, a standard, a measure, or a pledge, as is variously suggested by writers? And whether the true idea of money, as such, be not altogether that of a ticket or counter? The ingenious author certainly did not mean, in this query, to deny that gold and silver have an intrinsic value, but only to insinuate, that this is an accidental or secondary consideration from which we ought to abstract entirely in forming a precise idea of their function as money. This is perfectly evident from the qualifying words "as such," which he introduces into the Query.

In the third edition of his Effects of the Continental Blockade, Sir Francis D'Ivernois added a section on Ireland where he wrote

More than half a century ago, the celebrated Bishop of Cloyne, Doctor Berkeley, taught them, that all the money, which any nation possessed, beyond the amount required for transacting her commercial concerns, was a useless and expensive redunance.

In a footnote, D'Ivernois adds that "Bishop Berkeley and Dean Tucker, may be considered as the precursors of Adam Smith, in the science of political economy." Although D'Ivernois's presentation of Berkeley's monetary thought is not entirely accurate, he was clearly familiar with the Querist and approvingly provides several direct quotes, both here and in a later note.

In later years, attention was focussed almost entirely on Berkeley's views on money, with reprints of these portions of the Querist in 1829 and 1872, and Berkeley's other insights lay undeveloped. When Thomas Spence claimed, in 1807, Bishop Berkeley's authority for his view that Britain did not need foreign commerce (and therefore Napoleon's Continental Blockade was of little consequence), he probably did more harm than good by this one-sided reading of Berkeley's economics.²⁸

A little later, Maria Edgeworth wrote enthusiastically to David Ricardo²⁹

Among the number of questions I should wish to hear you discuss is one of vital consequence to this country--the question for and against the potatoe which has for some hundred years past been alternately cried up as the blessing and cried down as the bane of Ireland. In Berkeley's Querist (which by the by contains in the pressing style of interrogation as much deep thought in the subtle form of doubts as Socrates himself could have proposed had he lived in Ireland) there is this query "Whether it is possible Ireland should be well improved while our beef is exported and our labourers live upon potatoes."

Ricardo appears never to have replied.

It is curious that the influence of Berkeley on both Samuel Taylor Coleridge and on Robert Southey has been largely missed. Though they are known primarily as poets, the interest that both of them took in social issues is also well established. In the Watchman for March 17, 1796 Coleridge copies a succession of queries from Berkeley in replying to Dr. Beddoes³⁰

To counteract this slowness to good works, which may arise from total inexperience of the miseries of a scanty meal, we would address a few questions to the

two accessible parts of a rich man's heart--his avarice and his fears. 1. Whether the wealth of the highest classes does not ultimately depend on the labour of the lower classes? 2. Whether the man, who has been accustomed to love beef and clean linen, will not have stronger motives to labour, as well as greater ability, than the man who has used himself to exist without either? and whether extreme poverty does not necessarily produce laziness? 3. Whether therefore to provide plentifully for the poor be not feeding the root, the juices from which will shoot upwards into the branches, and cause the top to flourish? 4. When the root yieldeth insufficient nourishment, whether wise men would not wish to top the tree in order to make the lower branches thrive? 5. Whether hungry cattle do not leap over bounds?

While Southey does not appear to make any direct reference to the Querist in his writings, he did own a copy of the Querist. On the front page of Southey's copy is written³¹

An admirable little Book from which men of all ranks from the manufacturer to the Statesman may derive instruction.

Southey's copy was purchased by John Smith, the chief justice of New Hampshire, and he too commented below Southey's words

I have read it a 2nd or 3rd time & have had both pleasure & instruction. (13 Jany 1826)

If scholars take the trouble to collect more such marginalia then it is likely that we would have a better idea of just how well Berkeley succeeded in making people think.

IV. The formal study of economics in Ireland began with the transfer of the Rev. Richard Whately to the Archbishopric of Dublin. Whately was the Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford at the time of his promotion to Ireland and one of his first acts was to try and endow a chair of Political Economy at Trinity College, Dublin. Whately succeeded and the holders of this chair provided some of the most distinguished economists of the mid-nineteenth century, such as Mountifort Longfield and Isaac Butt. While the writings of these economists have been carefully studied, the possible links with Berkeley and the Dublin Society appear to be unexplored.³²

The relevance of classical economics as developed by Adam Smith, Malthus and Ricardo, was by no means perceived as obvious by members of the English Parliament. In debates on Irish relief in 1822 both Lord Lansdowne and the younger Peel were willing to see Ireland as an exception.³³

That it was mischievous to interfere with the regular course of supply and demand in the market was a principle no less generally recognized; but, no singular was the situation of Ireland, that this great principle of political economy must be violated. (Lansdowne).

The Irish government were endeavouring to give relief in every possible way; not with strict regard to the principles of political economy, for unhappily the case was one that compelled them to set all ordinary rules at defiance. (Peel)

However, Irish economic studies took a very different turn from the 1830s onwards.

A good case can certainly be made that the lectures of the Whately Professors on political economy were aimed at keeping the

lower classes contented. Mountifort Longfield broke with the Ricardian viewpoint on profits and wages, a view that encouraged an antagonistic conception of society, and had argued instead that the profit rate was determined by the marginal use of capital.

Politically, these "Irish" doctrines gave further support to the belief in free competition and to the futility of interference in any market, especially the labor market. As Longfield himself states of his new results, "It can be proved how impossible it is to regulate wages generally, either by combinations of workmen, or by legislative enactments." Furthermore, it appears that the efforts of Longfield and Whately were not unconnected, for in a book review of 1833 in the Dublin University Magazine, Longfield recommended an early version of Whately's Easy Lessons in preference to the works of either Harriet Martineau or Mrs. Marcet.³⁴

The writings of the Irish school were appreciated by John Barrington, an Irish manufacturer whose business had been ruined by striking workmen, or so he felt. As a result, Barrington endowed a lectureship of economics at Trinity College and specified that the lecturer was to tour Ireland as much as possible and attempt to demonstrate to the lower classes that combinations and strikes were not in their best interest.³⁵

An elementary version of the views that received sophisticated elaboration in Longfield's lectures was to be found in Richard Whately's Easy Lessons on Money Matters. As Whately's booklet remained on the list of recommended books for University students at least up to 1852, it provides the most convenient source for a study

of political bias. The first four editions have nothing to say on trade-unions, a deficiency that was remedied with a vengeance somewhere around 1840. Whately acquired a particular dislike for trade-unions and tended to blame them for all Ireland's economic ills. This attitude is fully mirrored in the booklet, for the last chapter is a bitter attack on trade-unions. Since an adaptation of this booklet was also the most widely used economic primer in Victorian schools, as J. M. Goldstrom has demonstrated, it is worth noting that the attack on trade-unions was not ignored by the working-class radicals. John Mitchell's United Irishman attacked Whately's Easy Lessons on at least four occasions.³⁶

In the Querist, Berkeley had put forth arguments supporting the encouragement of domestic Irish industry. A basic premise was that the good of Ireland was to be interpreted as the good of the common Irish man and furthermore that this common good was to be the primary aim of economic policy. Insofar as Berkeley and his friends had succeeded in identifying some of the crucial features of Irish poverty, we would expect their ideas to be resuscitated in the nineteenth century. The Dublin University Magazine carried an appreciative article on Berkeley (probably by Isaac Butt).³⁷

It is not too much to say that this work (which we cannot but conceive to have been strangely neglected in the histories of political philosophy) contains not only the germ of almost every project which has been since advocated on behalf of our island, but a clear statement of some of those general principles of political economy, the development of which, by later writers, has been regarded as an achievement of no common glory. The real import of money, as consisting not in intrinsic, but in conventional value, and as being

thus merely the counter of wealth, dependent for its sole worth on the stability of public credit; the reciprocal or inverse proportion of demand and supply; the primary importance of labour as the constituent of real wealth; these, and other principles which have now degenerated with the many into axiomatic truths, are found in these curt interrogatories, conceived and expressed with a perspicuity not common since their author's age, and, we believe, quite unequalled before it.

The conservative party in Ireland appears to have always supported these purely Irish sentiments.³⁸

Whately, of course, would have none of these native Irish economics. He believed in free trade of all sorts and protection to Irish domestic industry was but a trade-union writ large in his eyes. While Longfield appears to have acquiesced in the status quo of the Anglo-Irish, things were not thus with his successor, Isaac Butt. In 1840, Isaac Butt delivered a series of lectures, Protection to Home Industry, but, significantly, he did not publish them. In 1846, with the impending famine in Ireland, Butt published these lectures and they were immediately popular with radicals and Nationalists. John Mitchel now moved that this essay be purchased for Repeal reading-rooms and T. F. Meagher said that, "A soul has come into Ireland." The subtitle of Butt's pamphlet on protection was "Some Cases of Its Advantages Considered" and Butt enumerated such advantages exactly in the manner of Berkeley, whom he greatly admired, and the Dublin Society.³⁹ Butt emphasized the rights of laborers and the role of distribution. Aggregate wealth which was concentrated among a few was not true wealth in his eyes. Explicitly disavowing that a maximum of profits should be the goal of political economy, Butt argued that distribution was the nub of the issue.⁴⁰

It must be remembered that when we speak of resources becoming unproductive--we do not mean ceasing to yield a profit to the owner, but absolutely ceasing to produce the advantage to the country--the comforts and conveniences which they formerly yielded.

The radical defect of the orthodox theory was its assumption that resources would always be fully employed, an error, according to Butt, which pervaded even the writings of Longfield. As an example of his thesis, Butt said that the women who had been able to derive an income in their spare time spinning linen when the industry was protected were now all idle and facing penury. In sharp contrast to the ideas advocated by Whately and the other Whately professors, Butt was arguing that the Irish, rich and poor, should make common cause against their English masters.

The notion that the Irish should follow an independent path was advocated by the radical John Mitchel in Irish Political Economy.⁴¹ With the Irish famine staring them in the face, Mitchel was incensed by a letter from the Prime Minister which took it for granted that Ireland would continue to supply food to England. He reprinted Jonathan Swift's A Short View of the State of Ireland and Berkeley's Querist in order to spur interest in the causes of Irish poverty. In order to ensure the widest circulation "the publication is made in the smallest space, and cheapest form possible." Mitchel did not admire Berkeley as much as Swift and preferred the bitter denunciation of the Dean to the gentle exhortation of the bishop. What is of direct relevance to this paper is the linking of Swift, Berkeley and Butt. Mitchel approvingly quotes Butt's statement that

I know of no surplus produce until all our own people are fed.

and says of Berkeley that

The clearness and force with which he exhorts his countrymen to self-reliance and enterprise, make his "Querist" a valuable manual of Irish Political Economy; and it is quite as well suited to the year 1847 as it was to 1741. These questions have never been practically answered in Ireland yet.

It is important to emphasize that neither Mitchel nor Butt were opposed to the science of Political Economy. What they objected to was the "perverting and misapplying the principles of that science."⁴²

Whately and his friends quickly rose to the challenge. The Whately Professor of 1847 was W. Neilson Hancock, who, by coincidence, was also a good friend of Whately; in later years, Hancock noted that Whately had urged him to solve applied economic problems and not theoretical ones. Hancock replied to Butt (and Berkeley) in a paper read to the Dublin Statistical Society in 1848.⁴³ It is worth noting that Whately was president of this society, Longfield vice-president and J. A. Lawson, Butt's successor to the Whately Professorship, was one of the secretaries, Hancock himself being the second secretary. It is scarcely possible to discuss here the rights and wrongs of the case for Protection, one of the most hotly debated issues in Economics, but it is worth noting that Hancock believed the Irish case to be doomed by methodology alone. "The idea of having a science of exchanges peculiar to Ireland, under the name of Irish Political Economy, is about as reasonable as proposing to have Irish mechanics, Irish mathematics or Irish astronomy." The comparison with mechanics,

mathematics and astronomy is worth emphasizing. It shows how universal and how exact the Whately professors thought their science to be; if one had mentioned geology, or zoology, or botany instead the case for Irish economics would have appeared very differently. It may be noted that Butt himself considered that he was laying out the anatomy of the Irish economy. Introductory Lecture (Dublin, 1837), 44.

Whether Butt knew of Hancock's attack, or whether he would even have wished to reply in view of the violent events of the famine and thereafter, is not known. Suffice it to say that political economy for Ireland continued, in general, to be viewed like political economy for England.

Richard Whately was a great believer in "theory" and the open-ended, inquiring and curious method of Berkeley was quite the opposite. T. W. Hutchison has aptly characterized Berkeley's method as follows:⁴⁴

Berkeley's programme is rather built upwards out of particular practical proposals suggested by the closely-observed problems around him, than deduced downwards from a set of formulae or generalisations. Berkeley did not have at his disposal or seek to construct an organised orthodox set of definitions, assumptions, or 'tools of thought'. He simply brought to bear his great mind and deep sympathies on a set of practical commonsense proposals, introducing almost as a by-product the minimum of theory and analysis necessary for supporting and explaining his programme.

Berkeley (and Butt) did not object to theory per se, but rather to the (perhaps implicit) assumption that theory alone could provide a satisfactory guide to practical issues. The characterization of

Berkeley's general philosophy by Gavin Ardley appears to be just as applicable to his views on economic method.⁴⁵

explicit formulation is possible only for the part of the iceberg above the surface! Explicit formulations are true and indispensable; but they cannot reveal the depths, . . . On the other hand, common-sense is not intelligence in the abstract; common sense is rather intelligence joined with practical experience in our particular walk of life; by this conjunction intelligence becomes insight; and insight is revealed by the habitual justice of our judgments and deeds in specific circumstances.

This iconoclasm was unacceptable to the ruling economists, who preferred to have a theoretical "science" and then shout "exception" as and when needed.

Why, it may be asked, were the Whately professors so involved in teaching a form of political economy that would earn so little popularity? The answer would appear to lie in the fact that, as interpreted by Whately, Longfield and others, political economy was a branch of Natural Theology and served to demonstrate the existence and benevolence of the Deity. In Whately's case, this is all too visible. He accepted the Drummond Professorship of Political Economy at Oxford because he did not want the anti-christians to monopolize the subject. In his lectures at Oxford, he dealt at length with the harmony created by free-trade and later on even went on to argue that since chaos did not result from the pursuit of selfish interest by all, the Deity himself must be planning the eventual outcome! It would be a mortal blow to Whately's theodicy if any other economic arrangement than laissez-faire would produce happy economic outcomes.⁴⁶

Such a metaphysic of political economy did not belong to Whately alone. Longfield claimed that one of the motives of his lectures was

to show that the laws of economics were designed by the "Great Author of our being, with the same regard to our happiness which is manifested by the laws that govern the material world." Longfield began with a paraphrase from Berkeley on the importance of Distribution but this subsequently amounted to nothing.⁴⁷

For it is to be observed, that though the wealth of an individual may be expended in procuring vicious luxuries, yet that of a rich nation, as distinguished from a poor nation, will be found to consist in the great mass of its inhabitants being comfortably and wholesomely fed, lodged, and clothed, and well rewarded for their industry. If otherwise, that wealth must be wrongly distributed; the cause and cure of which wrong distribution come also within the province of the political-economist to investigate.

Isaac Butt devoted much of his introductory lecture to the compatibility of Christianity and political economy, but he was more inspired by the version of Christianity which emphasized feeding the hungry and clothing the naked. Economic theodicy was not as important as Christian action. In this too Butt was following Berkeley's words in the preface to the second edition of the Querist.

to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, by promoting an honest industry, will, perhaps, be deemed no improper employment for a clergyman who still thinks himself a member of the commonwealth. As the sum of human happiness is supposed to consist in the goods of mind, body, and fortune, I would fain make my studies of some use to mankind with regard to each of these three particulars, and hope it will not be thought faulty or indecent in any man, of what profession soever, to offer his mite towards improving the manners, health, and prosperity of his fellow-creatures.

V. In a video documentary on "Adam Smith and the Wealth of Nations" (produced by Liberty Fund), the noted economic historian, R. M. Hartwell praises Adam Smith for having disabused people of the fallacy that gold was real wealth and for having emphasized the benefits of economic growth for the common man. This praise can be bestowed upon George Berkeley with much greater truth. The late Lord Keynes not only considered Berkeley to have written some of the shrewdest essays of his age on economics, but also, according to his brother, Geoffrey Keynes,⁴⁸

When my brother, John Maynard Keynes, was forming his library designed to illuminate "the history of thought," I noticed that he kept an important place for the works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne. After my brother's death in 1947, I began to collect Berkeley's books for myself, having begun to realize the full interest and value of the published works of this great and good man. It was not an idle remark when Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, told the Earl of Berkeley he had hitherto supposed that "only angels possessed so much understanding, so much knowledge, so much innocence and such humility" as the young George Berkeley.

Unlike the modern tribe of development advisers, Berkeley lived out his beliefs.⁴⁹

At the commencement of the hard frost, in the long-remembered winter of 1739-40, he came down to breakfast one Sunday without a grain of powder in his Cloyne-made wig--for his own dress as well as that of his servants, was made at the village of Cloyne. His wife expressed her surprise at his unwonted appearance. 'We shall have a famine forthwith,' he replied, 'and I have desired that none of the servants put any powder in their wigs; neither will I.' The chaplain, the secretary, and the whole party took the hint. During all that winter, every Monday morning, he gave twenty pounds to be distributed among the poor of Cloyne, besides what they received out of his kitchen. He practised the maxims of his Querist, in encouraging

local handicraft, and he indulged his benevolent heart in giving with both hands.

Without adopting any of the high-flown Marxist categories so prevalent in Christian analyses of the Third World today, Berkeley and his friends set about ameliorating the poverty and suffering of eighteenth century Ireland by practical and practicable measures. The practice of utilizing local self-help to engender development from below and to emphasize the growth of human beings in the developmental process has today arisen once again, out the disillusionment with decades of "grand theories." It may not be out of place to remember some of the origins of this new movement--Non-Governmental Organizations or NGOs--in Ireland in the 1730s.

To summarize, first, the sale of 10 editions of the Querist is itself indication of considerable popularity; secondly, the absence of replies makes it clear that there was general agreement with Berkeley's views; thirdly, we know of Berkeley's undoubted influence on such economists as the Rev. Robert Wallace and on Thomas Mortimer; fourthly, circumstantial evidence suggests influence on Adam Smith, David Hume, Dugald Stewart and others; fifthly, Berkeley was admired by Irish Conservatives in the 1830's and 1840's and Isaac Butt even tried to incorporate a Berkeleian approach to political economy; finally, we find Berkeley admired by those who felt that there must be more to economic growth than mere accumulation and longed for a different kind of political economy. Berkeley's failure to write an integrated and simplified account that would be useful to the discipline is glaring. Coleridge said it best when he regretted that⁵⁰

Much injury has been done to society by the naked assertion of Truths which have been repeated till at least they have [been] treated with contempt as old Paradoxes. Ex. gr. If Berkeley instead of asserting that England could sustain three times its number, tho' it were encompassed by a brass Wall 50 cubits high, had written a treatise as long & eloquent as that which he squandered upon Tar Water & layed open the whole of the good, & all of the evil & delusion of Commerce, & artificial Wealth--my God, what a difference--(Dec 1800-June 1801, no. 893).

NOTES

1. A. C. Fraser, Life and Letters of George Berkeley (Oxford, 1871), 248.
2. S. Rashid, "The Irish School of Economic Development: 1720-1750," The Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies (December 1988), LVI, 4, 345-369.

The British Prime Minister, W. E. Gladstone, was presented a copy of A. C. Fraser's edition of Berkeley's works. However, the only Irish pamphlet Gladstone appears to have read was A Word to the Wise. W. E. Steinkraus, "A Note on Gladstone and Berkeley," Journal of the History of Philosophy (1971), 372-374.

3. "The Economic Bestsellers Before 1850," Baker Library, Harvard University, 1976. I am grateful to Dr. K. Carpenter, who was then Curator of the Kress Library, for a copy of this piece as well as the subsequent "Additions and Corrections."
4. The Querist, in A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessup (eds.), The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne (London, Thomas Nelson and Sons), 105-184.
5. Joseph Johnston, "Berkeley's Influence as an Economist," Hermathena (1953), 82, 76-89.
6. T. W. Hutchison, "Berkeley's Querist and its Place in the Economic Thought of the Eighteenth Century," British Journal for the Philosophy of Science (1953), IV, 13, 52-77.
7. Op. cit., 53.
8. "Ireland and the Critique of Mercantilism in Berkeley's Querist," in D. Berman, ed., George Berkeley: Essays and Replies (Irish Academic Press, Dublin, 1986), 101-116.
9. Op. cit., 108-109.

P. Murray, "Money, Wealth and Berkeley's Doctrine of Signs," in D. Berman, ed., op. cit., 152-156.

In correspondence, Dr. Kelly has pointed out that he was trying to show what Berkeley found unique about Ireland and not to expound Berkeley's general views on foreign trade,--the "key" to Berkeley's economics lies in his claim that a closed economy can prosper. Such a reading would resolve all substantial disagreement between us. For further development of Kelly's position as well as additional interesting material see "Berkeley and Ireland," Etudes Irlandaises (December 1986), 7-25. Kelly is

generally more critical of Berkeley's "friendly" attitude towards the Catholics. The most interesting point to be explored in this regard is David Berman's report of a priest from the north of Ireland who refuted Berkeley's characterization of native Irish laziness--"incontestably shew[ing] Sloth and Idleness are no more peculiar to our Countrymen, than they are to any other People on Earth"--but could not find a printer (as reported by Kelly, p. 25).

10. Life, 183.

G. Berkeley, An Essay Towards Preventing the Ruine of Great Britain (London, 1721), 5.

11. An overall view of Anglican clergymen-economists is given in S. Rashid, "The Clergymen-Scholars of Economic Development," This World (1983), no. 5, 94-106.

The irrelevance of Mandeville was first noted by Jacob Viner and is developed by T. Horne, The Social Thought of Bernard Mandeville (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978) and in S. Rashid, "Mandeville's Fable: Laissez-Faire or Libertinism?," Eighteenth Century Studies (Spring, 1985), 313-330.

Colin Campbell, The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987). Kelly's summary view of Berkeley in "Berkeley and Ireland" can be misleading in this regard, especially if read out of context from his other writings. "His [Berkeley's] vision of a society . . . where commercial activity was restricted to the meeting of needs rather than the creation of luxury" (op. cit., 22).

12. Hutchison, op. cit., 54.

13. Hutchison, op. cit., 53, note 1.

14. Hume's phobia about Public Credit is well-known, while Smith's negative attitude is not so often discussed.

15. Essay, op. cit., 8.

16. Life, 309. Such penetrating Christian appraisals of commerce are missing from A. O. Hirschman's otherwise valuable The Passions and the Interests (Princeton, 1977).

17. Gavin Ardley, Berkeley's Renovation of Philosophy (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1968), vi.

18. Johnston, op. cit., 88.

Hutchison, op. cit., 53.

19. David Bindon, A Scheme . . . (Dublin, 1738), Preface, A2.
20. Geoffrey Keynes, A Bibliography of George Berkeley (Oxford, Clarendon, 1976), 109.

M. A. Stewart, "Berkeley and the Rankenian Club," in Berman, ed., op. cit., 45.

This article also provides a critical review of the evidence for Berkeley's influence on Scottish intellectuals in the mid-eighteenth century.
21. M. Postlethwayt, A Dictionary of Trade . . . (London, 1766), Introduction, vi.
22. Quoted in G. Keynes, Bibliography, op. cit., 115.
23. Anon., The Oeconomical Table (London: Owen, 1766), Preface, vi.

A. Anderson, A Historical and Chronological . . . (London, 1801), III, 211 and II, 518. On page 147 of the same volume Anderson refers to Berkeley as Bishop of Derry (!) so it would appear that the earlier (anonymous) versions of the Querist circulated more than the later ones.
24. R. Wallace, Characteristics of the Present State of Great Britain (London, 1758), xiii, 48, 37. Wallace goes on to praise Hume's view that the benefit of the common man should be our primary concern but, as Wallace notes on p. 103, this too derives from Berkeley.
25. T. Mortimer, The Elements of Commerce, Finance and Politics (London, 1780), 375-391.
26. Lord Lauderdale, An Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Public Wealth (London, Constable, 1800), 118.

Thoughts on . . . Ireland (Edinburgh, Constable, 1805), 50-51.
27. D. Stewart, Lectures on Political Economy I, 337. This is volume VIII of The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart, ed. Sir W. Hamilton.
28. Sir Francis D'Ivernois, Effects of the Continental Blockade . . . (London, 1810), 81 and 193.

Francis Horner, a student of Dugald Stewart, referred to the Querist on money in his review of Lord King's pamphlet. The Economic Writings of Francis Horner, ed. F. W. Fetter (London, L.S.E., 1957), 80.

Britain Independent of Commerce in Spence's Tracts on Political Economy (New York, privately printed, 1933), 38, 55.

29. The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo, ed. P. Sraffa, IX, 230-231.
30. The Collected Works of S. T. Coleridge, vol. 2, ed. L. Patton (Princeton, 1963), 102.
31. This copy is in the Dartmouth College Library, Hanover, New Hampshire.
32. I have dealt with Whately in relationship to the history of economic ideas in "Richard Whately and Christian Political Economy at Oxford and Dublin," Journal of the History of Ideas (March 1977), 147-155.

A very readable biography of Whately has recently been written by D. H. Akenson, A Protestant in Purgatory: Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin (South Bend, 1981). A good general account of the subject of this paper may be found in R. D. C. Black, "Economic Studies at Trinity College Dublin" - I and II, Hermathena (1947), 65-80 and (1948), 52-63.

R. D. C. Black, Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870 (Cambridge, 1960), 107-110.

J. M. Goldstrom, "Richard Whately and Political Economy in School Books, 1833-1880," Irish Historical Studies (1966), 131-146. Also, see J. M. Goldstrom, The Social Content of Education, 1808-1870 (Shannon, 1972). Goldstrom is the only scholar I know of who has devoted attention to Whately's educational efforts.

33. F. W. Fetter, The Economist in Parliament, 1780-1868 (Duke U.P., Durham, 1980), 59.
34. Lectures on Political Economy (Dublin, 1834), vii.
35. R. D. Black, Centenary Volume of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland (Dublin, 1947), 6.
36. I have been unable to obtain copies of all editions of the Easy Lessons. The new chapter on Trade-Unions would probably have been sparked by the labour violence of 1837. It should be pointed out that Whately was not alone in his bias; F. A. D'Arcy, "The Artisans of Dublin and O'Connell, 1830-47," Irish Historical Studies (1972), 221-243.

United Irishman, March 18 (1848), 88.

Loc. cit. Whately knew of the attacks but was not unduly perturbed. D. J. Whately, Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D. D. . . . (London, 1866), II, 131. O'Connell too was attacked by labour pamphlets. E. Dawson, First Letter to the Tradesmen . . . (Dublin, 1845).

United Irishman, April 8, 15, and 22 (1848).

37. Dublin University Magazine (April 1836), 464-65.
38. Consider, for example, the speech of the Rev. Charles Boyton as quoted in the Dublin Penny Journal (1834), 107, or the book of James Butler Bryan, A Practical View of Ireland (Dublin, 1835).
39. D. Thornley, Isaac Butt and Home Rule (London, 1964), 17. As Butt's lectures were originally delivered in 1840, Thornley's suggestion that Butt's "Irish Economics" was based on his distancing himself from the Orange party is cast in doubt.
40. Butt, Protection to Home Industry (Dublin, 1846), 132.
Op. cit., Note K.
41. John Mitchel, Irish Political Economy (Dublin, 1847).
42. Op. cit., 9, 28, iv.
43. W. Neilson Hancock, "On the Compulsory Use of Native Manufacturers" (Dublin, 1848). I have relied on the copy available at the Kress Library of the Harvard Business School.

Hancock, op. cit., 1.
44. Hutchison, op. cit., 53.
45. Ardley, op. cit., 116, 114.
46. S. Rashid, "Richard Whately and the Struggle for Rational Christianity in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church (September 1978), 293-311.
47. Longfield, Lectures, 5, 7.
48. Keynes, Bibliography, op. cit., Preface.
49. Life, 262.

50. Coleridge, Notebooks, ed. K. Coburn (Princeton, 1968), I, 893.

The same point is made in 1829 by Sir James Mackintosh, "Perhaps the Querist contains more hints, then original, still unapplied, in legislation and political economy, than are to be found in any equal space." Dissertations, 211.

I am grateful to Gavin Ardley, T. W. Hutchison, Patrick Kelly and Patrick Murray for their comments. All errors are mine alone.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 005705550